

### REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are presented for consideration; no claims have been cancelled. However, claims 1-18 have been revised to address the formal, and substantive, issues raised by the Examiner, including overcoming the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The claims now particularly point out, and distinctly claim, the subject matter which applicant regard as the invention.

On page 3 of the Official Action, the Examiner has initially rejected claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-18 as being anticipated by Reinwall (4,034,532).

Reinwall discloses interconnections of corrugated roof panels of a building (see lines 5 to 15 of col. 1) which permit the roof panels to contract or expand when exposed to the weather elements (and the sun in particular). Instead, the present claims relate to “panels of a refrigeration unit”. Reinwall in no way discloses a refrigeration unit and therefore the claimed invention is plainly not anticipated by Reinwall.

Furthermore, the present claims relate to a male part comprising a “deformable element” which, in context, plainly means that “the element can change in shape to form the defined seal between the first panel and said second panel of the refrigeration unit”. In contrast, Reinwall discloses a clip member 12a (including web 14a) formed of sheet metal material (see line 25, col. 4 and Fig.7) which is rigid, and owing to its inherent lack of deformability, plainly does not form a seal (to a standard required for refrigeration units) between roof panels 50a and 52a. Indeed, the rigid clip member 12a must resist deformation to provide the required strength of the joint (see lines 33 to 37 of col. 4). Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present invention is further not anticipated by Reinwall.

Claim 5 (and 13) defines that the deformable element is integrally formed with the male part. The non-deformable clip 14a of Reinwall is plainly a separate part to the male part 51a (see Fig 8). Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 5 is not anticipated by Reinwall.

Claim 6 (and 14) defines that the deformable element provides a seal between the male and female parts of the refrigeration unit so that cold air cannot escape from the refrigeration unit at the joint. The roof panel joint of Reinwall is completely unsuitable for this purpose and therefore Applicants submit that claim 6 is not anticipated by Reinwall.

On page 4 of the Official Action, the Examiner has initially rejected claims 7-8 and 15-16 as being unpatentable over Reinwall (4,034,532) in view of Anderson (4,184,301).

MPEP 2143.01 states that "*The test for obviousness is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art, and all teachings in the prior art must be considered to the extent that they are in analogous arts*".

The present invention lies in the art of refrigeration units (see claims and technical field). In contrast, the invention of Reinwall lies in the unrelated art of building construction (see lines 5 to 15 of col. 1) and the invention of Anderson also lies in the unrelated art of building construction (see field of invention, col. 1). Accordingly, the Examiner has relied upon the art of Reinwall and Anderson which are in non-analogous fields to refrigeration units, and are therefore not pertinent. Applicants therefore submit that the present invention is not obvious.

Although Anderson discloses separate beads 17, 47, these beads are not defined by the element 36 as defined in claims 7 and 15. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 15 are further not obvious.

Claim 8 (and 16) defines that the beads are formed at free ends of the deformable element which is also not disclosed in Anderson. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 15 are further not obvious.

In summary, applicants assert that the Examiner's objections and rejections have been successfully traversed, and the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration, and allowance, of the application are courteously solicited.

If the Examiner believes that prosecution may be advanced by a telephone conference, or a personal interview, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at 703.415.0100.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 4, 2009

Martin P. Hoffman  
Martin P. Hoffman  
Reg. No. 22,261

HOFFMAN, WASSON & GITLER, PC  
2461 South Clark Street, Suite 522  
Arlington, VA 22202  
703.415.0100  
Attorney Docket No.: A-10044.AMA/bh